

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Г	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.			
	10/723,533	11/26/2003	Anandaroop Bhattacharya	111079-135105	8659			
	25943 7	590 03/29/2005		EXAMINER				
	SCHWABE,	SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITES 1600-1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE			CHERVINSKY, BORIS LEO			
					PAPER NUMBER			
	PORTLAND,	- -		2835				
				DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					A·H			
-		Application N	lo.	Applicant(s)				
Office Astine Comment		10/723,533		BHATTACHARYA ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Boris L. Cherv	•	2835	•			
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports or Reply	pears on the co	ver sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE - External control	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 er SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the provided period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, h ly within the statutory will apply and will exp e, cause the applicatio	owever, may a reply be timminimum of thirty (30) daysire SIX (6) MONTHS from on to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication (35 U.S.C. § 133).	on.			
Status			•					
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 N	lovember 2003.						
		s action is non-f						
3)	<u></u>							
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle	e, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	٠			
Disposit	ion of Claims				;*			
4)🛛	Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application).						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🛛	Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			•				
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requi	rement.		•			
Applicat	ion Papers				•			
9)🔯	☑ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)🛛)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 April 2004</u> is/are: a)□ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note t	he attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119		٠		. •			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	•		-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority document				•			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•		d in this National Stage				
* 0	application from the International Bureau	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	٠.	, i			
	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	or the certified	copies not receive	a				
	•							
844- 1								
Attachmen	• •	л Г	Intonvious Surrey	(DTO 442)	,			
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) L						
3) 🛛 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PTO-152)				
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) [Other:	4-				

Application/Control Number: 10/723,533

Art Unit: 2835

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not provide a concise statement of the technical disclosure. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the heat

Art Unit: 2835

exchanger and the pump must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner. the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 1-19, 24, 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,533

Art Unit: 2835

Claims 1-19, 24, 25-31 are vague and indefinite because the heat exchanger and the pump are not shown in the drawings.

Claim 14 is vague and indefinite because the terminology of the claim lacks of an antecedent basis with the specification, the heat spreader cannot be positively defined element since it is not defined in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozmat in view of Dessiatoun et al.

Ozmat discloses the cooling device for the integrated circuit coupled to substrate including the thermal management device comprising an aluminum case 17 enclosing the porous medium 19, which is bonded to the case 17 (col.3, lines 61-63) and cooling fluid such as water circulating through the case; the porous medium is the microporous metal foam made of copper or aluminum (col. 3, lines 44-49), the thermal interface 13 is coupling the integrated circuit to the case 17. Ozmat discloses the claimed invention except the heat exchanger and the pump. Dessiatoun discloses the thermal management device including the heat exchanger 36 and the pump 38. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the heat

Art Unit: 2835

exchanger and the pump as disclosed by Dessiatoun in the device disclosed by Ozmat for cooling and circulation of the cooling medium for efficient heat removal. The details drawn to the size of pores, size of the porous medium and the integrated circuit would have been an obvious matter of design choice, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). The intended use the cooling device for an entertainment unit, disk player or networking interface is obvious since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris L. Chervinsky whose telephone number is 571-272-2039. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2835

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BORIS CHÉRVINSKY

Horic. h. Chew, was